

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
at CHATTANOOGA

JAMIE LAUREN STEELE

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

)
)
)
)
)
)

No. 1:12-cv-96/1:10-cr-103
Mattice/Carter

MEMORANDUM

Jamie Lauren Steele ("Steele") filed a virtually blank motion to vacate, set aside, or correct her sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (Criminal Court File No.43).¹ Although her thirteen-page motion is on a § 2255 form, Steele only completed the first page of the motion, included trial counsel's identifying information, and signed the motion. Beyond the references to "See Brief (Incoming)," which has never been filed, Steele provided no hint as to the grounds for any grant of relief under § 2255, nor did she identify any facts that might support any such relief under § 2255 or request any specific relief.

Finding that the § 2255 motion was, in effect, nothing more than a request for an extension of time in which to file a § 2255 motion, the Court notified her that because her § 2255 motion was subject to dismissal she had twenty days from April 9, 2012, to show cause why equitable tolling or one of the criteria in § 2255(f)(2)-(4) saves her motion and permits her to amend it (Criminal Court Doc. 45). Instead, Steele filed another § 2255 motion claiming counsel rendered ineffective assistance without providing any factual support or a memorandum in support of the claim. Instead, Steele referred the Court to a non-existent memorandum in support of her § 2255 motion (Criminal Court Doc. 46).

¹ Each document will be identified by the Court File Number assigned to it in the underlying criminal case.

She also filed a motion requesting an extension of time in which to file a brief (Criminal Court Doc. 47) which the Court denied, explaining it did so for the same reasons it denied her first motion requesting an extension and reminding her that her case would be dismissed if she did not respond to the Court's show cause order by April 30, 2012 (Criminal Court Doc. 48).

Steele has failed to file a response to the Court's Show Cause Order, a sufficient § 2255 motion, or any type of response to the Court's last order. Therefore, this action will be **DISMISSED** *sua sponte* for failure to comply with the orders of this Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); *Jourdan v. Jabe*, 951 F.2d 108 (6th Cir. 1991) (Criminal Court Docs. 43, 46).

An appropriate judgment order will enter.

/s/Harry S. Mattice, Jr.
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE